



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,048	12/06/2001	Yasuro Matsuzaki	108397-00052	4931

7590

06/11/2003

ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC
Suite 600
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER

TAN, VIBOL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2819

DATE MAILED: 06/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

10/003,048

Applicant(s)

MATSUZAKI, YASUROU

Examiner

Vibol Tan

Art Unit

2819

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 20-36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6,18 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5 and 7-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (U. S. PAT. 6,446,152).

In claims 1, 2, and 6, Song et al. teaches all claimed features in Figs. 1 and 2, an input/output interface, wherein a logical value (data value) is expressed by an order (data streams are offset in time in abstract read as an order) that transition edges (rising and falling edges) appear in a plurality of transmission signals (32-38) transmitting respectively on a plurality of signal lines (32-38); wherein each of said transmission signals include a plurality of the transition edges (plurality of positive edges or plurality of negative edges, Fig. 2); and said logical value (data value) is expressed by combining the order that the respective transition edges appear in the transmission signals; and wherein said transmission signals express one (data) or both of data and an address.

In claim 18, Song et al. teaches all claimed features in Figs. 1 and 2, the input/output interface according to claim 1, wherein a transmitting circuit (10) for

transmitting said transmission signals (12-18) and a receiving circuit (20) for receiving said transmission signals are respectively formed on separate semiconductor chips (col. 2, first circuit card 10 is separated from second circuit card 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Song et al.

In claim 19, Song et al. teaches all claimed features in Figs 1 and 2, the input/output interface according to claim 1, wherein a transmitting circuit (10) for transmitting said transmission signals (12-18) and a receiving circuit (20) for receiving said transmission signals; with the exception of showing that the transmitter circuit and the receiver circuit are both formed on the same semiconductor. However, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

Therefore; it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to integrate the transmitter circuit and the receiver circuit, in order to reduce cost and save space.

5. Claims 3-5 and 7-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 20-36 appear to be containing allowable subject matters.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vibol Tan whose telephone number is (703) 306-5948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:00 AM-4:30 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike J. Tokar can be reached on (703) 305-3493. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7724 for regular communications and (703) 305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0959.

Vibol Tan



Patent Examiner, AU 2819